HUMAN EVENTS

Vol. XIV, No. 2 Saturday, January 12, 1957 Washington, D. C.

THE LIBRARY
WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

Printed in Two Sections

News Section

The New President: The race for the naming of the next President of the United States has already started — this time, for the first time in history, even before the inauguration of the President who will retire four years hence. Those here who predicted that competition for his place would develop soon after Ike's second election have been proved correct.

For the step of Senator Knowland, in announcing his plan to retire from the Senate next year, signifies indelibly — to all political correspondents here — that he is "running like mad" for the GOP nomination for President in 1960. Those who assume he is retiring from politics are few indeed in the Capital. All Knowland's friends say without qualification that he plans to capture the Governorship of California next year and that such a success would be merely a steppingstone to the White House. Word from the Golden state suggests that incumbent Governor Knight will not impede Knowland's plans and that he may well be the GOP candidate to succeed Knowland in the Senate.

As Governor of California, Knowland would control one of the largest delegations to the GOP convention in 1960 (by that time California will rival New York as the pivotal state). As one wag in Washington put it, "While Nixon picks up White House support, Knowland is picking up delegates."

If he becomes Governor, Knowland will be free of White House restraints, which he has had to suffer as minority leader. (He will begin to show his independence long before he retires from the Senate.) Thus, he will be in an excellent position to consolidate behind him the old Taft following to which he, as Taft's anointed successor, is entitled, and which he will be able henceforth to lead untrammeled by considerations of what Ike wants.

Once his campaign for the Presidency begins in 1959, he can, for instance, promise in no uncertain terms an economy administration and tax reduction, a program which Senator Taft, in his famous September 1952 Morningside Heights conference with Candidate Ike, insisted must be a primary objective of a Republican Administration-elect and on which point Ike and Taft split sharply behind the scenes in the spring of 1953. The Knowland move, it is believed, means that the prospect now is for a GOP candidacy thoroughly consecrated to traditional GOP principles, and not to "modern Republicanism."

Knowland's announcement serves also the cause of party realignment. Among Southern Democratic Senators, there was instantaneous and wide applause. The Californian is in a position to resume the policy of Taft, whose partiality for playing ball with Southern conservatives was well known.

Behind Closed Doors: One factor which strongly swayed Knowland to make his momentous decision was a behind-the-scenes clash with Vice President Nixon last week. Actually, the incident involved two other GOP Senators — Saltonstall and Bridges. An account relayed to us by a confidential source serves to light up interesting features of the secret history of the Republican party.

On Tuesday, January 1, just before Congress opened, Nixon met with Knowland, Saltonstall and Bridges to discuss strategy as to how to handle the "liberal" bid for a change in the Senate rules. Under the present rules, Senate debate can be ended ("cloture") only by a two-thirds vote of the entire Senate. In practice this allows one-third plus one of the Senate to extend free debate, and permits filibusters. The "liberals" have long wanted to convert "cloture" into a simple majority vote. In this discussion Nixon took the "liberal" side, placing the power of the majority above the rights of the minority.

All three Senators — Knowland, Bridges and even Saltonstall (often classified as "liberal") — challenged Nixon on this. Saltonstall, surprisingly enough, was quite emphatic in opposing Nixon's view and in defending the traditional rules of the Senate. Knowland kept pointing out that two-thirds of the Senate "continued" — only one-third changing every two years — and that the Senate was a "continuing body."

To most of these arguments, Nixon replied that he was "the symbol" of the White House in the Senate, with the implication that he thereby expressed its will in this matter.

Knowland strongly rebutted this view, contending that the Vice President's function was not to

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1957 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

represent the White House on the Hill, but to act as presiding officer of the upper house.

Bridges reportedly also objected to the idea of a "symbol of the White House" in the Senate, but laid the most stress on Nixon's obligations to the conservatives in the Senate and the party — citing how they had defended him against left-wingers, staged the write-in vote for him in New Hampshire, and effectively cinched his renomination at the San Francisco convention last summer. One of the reproaches tossed at Nixon was that Knowland had led the floor fight for Nixon which insured his victory at San Francisco.

Whether these reproaches were fair or not, and whether Nixon's reasoning was correct or not, the fact is that the gathering revealed some sharp differences in the very heart of the Grand Old Party, which may affect the outcome in 1960, when Ike has to retire.

Under the Capitol Dome: Dirksen is slated to become GOP Senate leader to succeed Knowland when the latter retires in 1958. By seniority and prestige, Senator Bridges stood in order of succession to Knowland's job. But it is known that the New Hampshire man does not want the job. He prefers that a more physically vigorous man should occupy the post. Dirksen, just named GOP whip, will be a seasoned manager of party affairs on the floor by two years hence.

Colleagues say the Illinois Senator is "himself again," meaning the unreconstructed Western "America Firster" of yore. It is said he regrets his compromises in favor of Ike's foreign aid policy during the election campaign; reportedly he now believes he did not need such a "coattail" performance to win re-election. Unlike some GOP colleagues, he has nothing important he wishes from the Executive; nor is he, like some, interested in a judgeship or an Executive appointment. The Illinoisan — such is the estimate — should prove a courageous, highly principled successor to Knowland. (It is noted that Dirksen, coming from Illinois, with its heavy Negro vote, courageously voted with the conservatives to table the motion to revise the filibuster rules.)

● Southern Democrats register keen disappointment over the first vote of Senator Frank L. Lausche (following the Ohioan's vote with the Democrats on organizing the Senate — which, of course, all Democrats hailed with glee). Lausche voted with Senator Clinton Anderson's liberal coalition group against tabling the motion to revise the Senate rules. Lausche had run up some credit with Southern Democrats because he had stated, last year, that he was for FEPC for Ohio only, not for a Federal FEPC. At least, that was how Southerners interpreted his remarks. Only two Northern Democrats joined Southerners in the vote to table the motion: Bible of Nevada, successor to Pat McCarran; and Green of Rhode Island. Lausche's vote with the liberals has drawn some comment that "this is a sign he's running for the No. 1 position in 1960."

● Some of the independence — so often heard in cloakrooms and clubhouses, but not always in public — of GOP grass roots members of Congress is typified by Representative August Johansen's remarks in his January 3 release to constituents: "Those responsibilities [of the legislator] cannot be met either by a casual, rubber-stamp acquiescence to all requests and recommendations of the Executive branch or by any equally superficial attitude of opposition for the mere sake of opposition. What is clearly called for in the months ahead is painstaking fact-finding, full debate of the issues, and courageous decisions." (For a very penetrating study of the independence of the new Congress, see the article, "The Coming Revolt on Capitol Hill," by David Shea Teeple [a frequent contributor to HUMAN EVENTS] in the February *American Mercury*.)

Around the Town: Some who talk with the President note one feature of his conversation — his frequent praise of the ex-NATO commander, General Alfred Gruenther (now head of the Red Cross). One conclusion drawn: that Gruenther may be named successor to Dulles as Secretary of State.

● Along Washington's diplomatic row, it is believed that the projected visit of Marshal Tito of Yugoslavia to Washington is "off," or at least postponed for some time. The sour reception of many legislators to the project suggested that it would be hazardous to count on an invitation from Congress to Tito to address that body in joint session as has been the custom with chiefs of state.

● Capitol Hill hears with regret that Dr. John Von Neuman, member of the Atomic Energy Commission, is — and for some time has been — very ill in Walter Reed Hospital. He is an invaluable scientist but it is doubted that the AEC will ever again enjoy his active participation. Hence, it is asked: why has there been no other commissioner appointed to this key post?

● Chanceries along diplomatic row noted one vital aspect of the choice of Harold MacMillan as Britain's Prime Minister. MacMillan heads the right wing of the Conservative party which favors resistance (by slowdown, not repeal) to "welfarism" whereas R. A. Butler, who was passed over,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

leads the left wing, which says the Conservatives should compete with the Labor party in the advocacy of welfare measures.

U.S. Gold Policy: Following the Hungarian uprising, Soviet Russia unloaded sizeable amounts of gold on the European market. The London *Times* reported: "The Soviet Union's increased sales of gold to the West have immediately posed the question of whether Russia is preparing to underwrite Hungary's commercial debts." The London *Financial Times* noted: "Russia is faced with the necessity of giving economic aid to countries like Poland and Hungary . . ."

Whatever currency Russia got for the gold, the fact is that the U.S. policy of accepting gold from any source and giving dollars for it eases Russia's path. We are the residual buyers of all gold; our statutory price determines the world price. The New Deal dollar devaluation put U.S. currency and products on the bargain counter for all the world. Both the silver and gold programs subsidized world production of these metals then and still do.

In wartime we refused to buy "tainted" gold plundered by the Nazis. But gold bearing the hammer and sickle mark is still treated as untainted. No wonder — it is remarked — that Red Russia continues to be a major gold-mining country, digging up with slave labor the stuff with which to undermine capitalism.

States' Rights: Fifteen Senators, including four Republicans, have joined in sponsoring the so-called "states' rights" bill designed to nullify the preemption doctrine under which the Supreme Court has invalidated several state laws in recent years.

The fact that the 15 include Chairman James O. Eastland of the Senate Judiciary Committee and several of its members is evidence that the measure will receive prompt attention by that group.

It has also been re-introduced in the House by its original author, Representative Howard W. Smith of Virginia, and again has been designated HR3. The going will be rougher there, however, in view of the opposition of the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, ultra-liberal Representative Emanuel Celler of New York.

The Supreme Court currently holds to the theory that if Congress passes a law in any particular field, it thereby preempts exclusive jurisdiction over that entire field to the Federal Government and precludes states from enacting their own local laws in the same field. The most publicized instance was last April's ruling knocking out the Pennsylvania sedition law on grounds that Congress had asserted exclusive jurisdiction in the field when it enacted the Smith (anti-subversion) Act in 1940. Forty other states had similar laws.

The states' rights bill provides that the presumption shall be in favor of validity of the state law, unless there is specific preemptive language in the Federal statute or an obvious conflict. Other bills are being introduced to apply specifically to the anti-sedition field.

A specific sedition bill and the over-all measure both were approved by the Senate committee last year but too late to gain Senate consideration. Celler's House Committee approved a version of Smith's bill, but one so watered down that Smith did not bother trying to push it through to passage.

Racketeering Probe: Educated Capitol Hill guesses are that there will be a thorough Senate investigation of racketeering in labor unions, conducted by a special committee.

The Senate Investigating Subcommittee and the Senate Labor Committee both are asserting jurisdiction and asking $250,000 to conduct the unquestionably needed inquiry. A general aura of mutual suspicion and distrust probably will result in its ultimately becoming some sort of joint operation.

Republicans trust the Investigating Subcommittee's chairman, John L. McClellan of Arkansas, but they do not trust his subcommittee counsel, young Robert Kennedy, brother of the Senator from Massachusetts. While not defending the record of any of the unions involved, they view it as more than coincidental that the only unions studied in Kennedy's preliminary staff investigations have been those which supported President Eisenhower for re-election.

On the other hand, the make-up of the Labor Committee, which undoubtedly has legal jurisdiction under the Congressional Reorganization law, is such as to prompt a widespread fear that if it conducted the probe, union bosses would call its shots and make it only as effective as they desire. With a few exceptions, such as GOP Senator Barry Goldwater of Arizona and the new Democratic member, Strom Thurmond of South Carolina, this committee is composed primarily of "liberals" who would pay too much attention to the union bosses.

The issue probably will be settled late this month, likely by an agreement between McClellan and Labor Committee Chairman Lister Hill of Alabama for a joint setup comprising selected representatives of both committees and with a special counsel not identified with either faction. The only point in full agreement now is that the investigation is long overdue.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Analysis of the Election: The respected Washington research organization, *Congressional Quarterly*, in its *Weekly Report* for January 4, offers a final word on last fall's elections. Rating Senatorial candidates according to the support they gave President Eisenhower in Congress or — in the case of those who were not incumbents — the support the President tendered their campaigns, CQ comes to the following conclusions:

Six "new Republicans" — Kuchel, Cooper, Morton, Javits, Dirksen, and Hickenlooper — were elected. Five — Bender, Duff, Langlie, McKay, and Thornton — were beaten.

Three conservative Senators, with below average records of supporting the President, gained re-election. These were Capehart, Young, and Case. One such Senator — Welker — was defeated.

It is, observers say, stretching things a bit to include Hickenlooper and Dirksen in the "new Republican" category. Depending on whether or not these two Senators are included, the "new Republicans" elected just over, or just under, 50 per cent of their candidates. Conservative Republicans, on the other hand, elected a highly satisfactory 75 per cent.

Letter from KATHARINE KENNEDY BROWN, Republican National Committeewoman from Ohio: "I consider HUMAN EVENTS so important that I read it each week immediately upon arrival and frequently use excerpts from it in speeches and in the program material which I prepare for our three hundred clubs in Ohio."

WRITE YOUR CONGRESSMAN: Our discussion with Republican members of Congress, since their return to Washington, indicates that most of them are opposed to "modern" Republicanism — the Palace Guard's attempt to "take the Deal away from the New Dealers." (In 1938, New Deal intellectual Edmund Wilson wrote: "We must take communism away from the Communists.")

The message conservative Republicans ask us to pass on to our readers is this: whether "modern" Republicanism makes progress against the present strong conservative tide depends upon the people back home.

Reuther and Co. stimulate letter-writing campaigns to members of Congress, their publications (17,000,000 circulation) laud or condemn members for their attitudes toward legislation; the labor bosses dip into union treasuries to help their puppets. Traditional Republicanism can and will win — say conservatives in Washington — if their supporters back home will get the habit of writing their Congressmen and helping re-elect those who vote their way.

Debunking Federal Aid: Monitors of educational trends say that a recent Chicago speech by Roger A. Freeman, now being circulated in printed form, contains some of the most telling arguments against Federal Aid to Education yet drawn together in one source. Freeman, former Research Director for the Education Committee of the Intergovernmental Relations Commission, analyzes, point by point, the argument that American education is suffering from a lack of funds.

"Education," Freeman says, "for many years has been the largest item of public expenditure in the United States next to national defense. The cost of education accounts for about one-third of all state and local expenditures, and is about twice as great as the outlay for the next largest public function, highways . . . school funds have consistently risen faster than enrollment, or other public services, and are continuing to do so.

"If we deduct war-connected expenditures from the national income and relate the rest of our income to expenditures for education, we find that the share going to education has risen from 1.5 per cent in 1900 to 4.6 per cent in 1955."

Freeman follows the subtle step from arguing that "money" is needed to arguing that *Federal* "money" is needed. He notes that a Gallup poll last year "indicated that 68 per cent of the persons questioned favored Federal aid to schools."

This has come about, he says, because the opponents of Federal aid have let the controversy go "by default." Freeman calls for a "nationwide movement . . . to lay the true facts before the American public." Otherwise, he says, "sooner or later Federal aid will be enacted."

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 5 weeks $1.

Yearly rate, $10; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3.

By first class mail, $12 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $14 a year. FOREIGN: by regular mail, $13 a year; airmail, $18.

Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address.

Bound Annual Volume with complete Index $15. Only 1955 and 1956 Volumes are available.

The Declaration of Independence opens: "When in the course of HUMAN EVENTS . . ."

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher*
JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
Contributing Editors: FRANK CHODOROV, M. STANTON EVANS

HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Entered as second class matter at Washington, D. C. Copyright 1957.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XIV, No. 2 HUMAN EVENTS January 12, 1957

Article Section

WHY THE INCOME TAX MUST GO

Questions I've Been Asked

by CORINNE GRIFFITH

WHEN I FIRST started speaking for repeal of the Sixteenth Amendment I was fearful of the questions that audiences might put to me. I knew I could answer the honest questions, those that called for information about fiscal matters, for I had given considerable study to the subject. But what would I do with the heckling questions — those that opponents throw at the speaker for the purpose of upsetting him? This bothered me.

The problem solved itself, however, after the first few lectures. I learned that if I stuck to principle — that income taxation is not merely a revenue measure but rather a means of increasing the power of the Government over the people — the questions answered themselves. The art of the heckler is to use words so as to confuse the speaker; to get to his meaning you have to unravel his words. It wasn't long before I learned that my opponent's real purpose was to support Big Government, or some form of collectivism, even though he was careful to disguise that purpose in the wording of his question. All I had to do was to show up the direction of his thinking; the question lost all importance.

I have made talks before all sorts of audiences — business groups, ladies' clubs, legislatures, middle, low and high income tax brackets. I have spoken in trailer camps. After a half dozen talks it occurred to me that there are not as many questions as I had at first imagined. The same questions came popping up at all the meetings. In time I learned to detect what the questioner had in mind almost as soon as he began phrasing his query, and was ready with the answer before he finished speaking.

FOLLOWING ARE THE principal questions I have been called upon to answer. Different questioners, of course, word their queries differently, but the information they seek and the doubts they have as to the feasibility of repealing the Sixteenth Amendment are generally the same. I have taken the liberty of making composites of the questions as well as of the answers.

Q. How can the Government get along without the income tax?

A. That is not my concern. I am concerned with how *we* can get along with the income tax. Can we remain a free people if one-third of our annual earnings are confiscated? That is the question we must face. But, if you are bothered with fiscal matters, keep this in mind: the Government of the United States got along without an income tax — except for the Civil War years — from 1789 to 1913. It managed very well, for during most of these 124 years it balanced its budget, and in some years it had a surplus. Of course, the Government did not go in for foreign aid, subsidized housing, welfare schemes, power plants, and so on; and it did not have two-and-a-half million timeservers to support.

Q. How about defense? Would the Government be able to meet its defense budget without the income tax?

A. That question cannot be answered without first ascertaining what defense consists of. When you buy something you ought to know what you are paying for. There are military men who maintain that the foot soldier is a

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1957 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

thing of the past, that his function in the winning of wars is minor. Yet, in the name of defense, we now have the largest infantry in the history of the country, spread all over the world, each man representing an annual outlay of $10,000. . . . Then, much of our foreign aid program is described as expenditures for defense — to fatten up possible allies for the coming conflict. . . . How much of the money appropriated for defense is used by the various services to propagandize the country in favor of larger appropriations? . . . The fact is, the word "defense" has become a sacred cow. We must not even question any Government expenditure that is labelled "defense." Maybe the spenders would provide us with a better defense if they had less to spend. Some military men say so.

Q. What would you substitute for income taxation?

A. The purpose of repealing the income tax law is to reduce the power of the Government. We are afraid of that centralization of power which has in other countries preceded the introduction of socialism, communism, fascism. The only way to prevent something like that happening in America is to return to the republican form of Government which we had before the Sixteenth Amendment was passed. That is, a Government representing the states of the Union and responsive to them. If the Sixteenth Amendment were repealed, the central Government would have to return to the original concept of independent states — the concept imbedded in the Constitution.

If the Federal Government insists on spending more than it believes it can raise through Federal taxes, it would be obliged to assess each state in accordance with its population; the census would decide how much each state must pay.* The effect of that would be that the various state governments would be obliged to scrutinize the Federal budget. Such scrutiny would result in squeezing the "fat" out of the budget. The Federal Government would not be able to go in for all sorts of spending sprees, members of Congress from New York would probably vote against a TVA project, Michigan would question the advisability of subsidizing cotton farmers, and all the states would raise doubts as to foreign aid programs. Economy would be forced on the central Government, and an economical central Government cannot invade our liberties.

*Former Utah Governor J. Bracken Lee has suggested that the states be assessed on the basis of their per capita income.

Q. What would happen to old age pensions if the Sixteenth Amendment were repealed?

A. Before I answer that I would like to point out that the states always had the power to tax incomes, and if the Sixteenth Amendment were repealed they could exercise that power. If the citizens of any state wanted an old age pension system they could vote for it. Possibly, one of the states would come up with a sound system, one that is based on actuarial figures, not political expediency.

The present plan is sheer fraud. The social security taxes are merely taxes. What is taken out of the pay envelope is spent immediately, just like any other income of Government. Then the Government sets up for what it collected and spent something it calls a reserve fund. This consists of Government bonds. The interest on these bonds, it is hoped, will meet the benefit payments. But, the interest on these bonds comes from taxes, new taxes. So then, the beneficiaries, the old folks, are not supported by the savings they were forced to make, but by the production of their children. Their so-called savings go down the drain of Government expenses long before they receive their benefits. Keep in mind that this fraudulent scheme was made possible by the Sixteenth Amendment, that the so-called social security taxes are in fact levied on the pay envelope.

Q. Can foreign aid be continued without income taxation?

A. No. But you will have more money in your pay envelope, and if you are inclined to send

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

your money abroad, who will stop you? What we call foreign aid is not aid to destitute men, women and children. It is aid to foreign Governments who, it is hoped, will show their appreciation when we need allies. In the meantime, what we call foreign aid is an attempt to interfere with the internal affairs of foreign nations, a program that is bound to get us into trouble. Besides — and this ought to be kept in mind — our foreign aid program is unconstitutional. Under our Constitution, the power to tax is granted to the Government so that it can meet its legitimate expenses, which do not include the expenses of other Governments.

Q. Who pays most of the income taxes?

A. Last year, personal income taxes — taxes paid by individuals, not corporations — came to $33 billion. According to a Treasury report, those earning from $1,200 to $10,000 paid 60 per cent of this amount, or $20 billion. Those earning upwards of $10,000 paid only 40 per cent, or $13 billion.

This does not mean that the Government is lenient on higher incomes; progressive income taxation makes it rather silly to try to get into the higher brackets. But, there are always more poor than rich, and taken in the aggregate the many poor earn more than the few rich. The national pay envelope contains more dollars than the bank accounts of the wealthy. It was inevitable that the Government, in search of revenue, should have applied itself to the pay envelope. That is sound highwaymanry; you go where the getting is good. What started out as a "soak the rich" measure had to become a "soak the poor" measure.

Q. How do you propose to take care of the Federal debt without income taxes?

A. As the rate of income has increased, so has the Federal debt. None of this revenue is applied to reducing the debt, and the indications are that none of it will be. Whether or not the Sixteenth Amendment is repealed, it does not seem likely that the Federal debt will be met. Or, if it is met, it will be met by repudiation or inflation. That is, some administration in the future will wipe the slate clean by telling the bondholders to tear up their holdings — that they are no good anyway. That has happened before, usually after a disastrous war. On the other hand, the Government, which has a monopoly of making money, may pay off its obligations by the printing press method. Until that happens the Government will always have too many pressing needs to think of reducing its debt. The best the bondholders can expect is to receive interest payments.

Q. Will higher excise and sales taxes be easier on the small earner than the income tax?

A. This is like the other question — what will replace the income tax? No other tax will yield as much revenue as the income tax. If the Sixteenth Amendment were repealed, the Government would probably turn to consumption taxes. These taxes, which are added to the prices of the things you consume, have a way of limiting themselves. If you don't smoke or drink liquor, you don't pay taxes on tobacco or alcohol. Consumption taxes are paid on what is consumed and, if they are prohibitive, consumption is reduced.

To get any revenue at all, the Government will have to hold down taxes on consumable goods. Abstinence does the trick. Income taxes have to be paid, regardless of what you consume; abstinence does not help you hold down the rates.

Q. If the states tax incomes, how are we better off?

A. No state can go hog wild in levying on incomes. The nearer the Government is to the people the more control the people have over it. The tax collector is a neighbor, not a "foreigner" from Washington, and is therefore more sensitive to social sanctions. There is another reason for a state government being reasonable in its

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rates. It is always in competition with other states. If one state taxes more heavily than another, the one with the lower rates will advertise the fact so as to attract citizens or industry.

These are the principal questions I have been asked. There are others, all of a collectivistic character, indicating that the questioners are of that frame of mind. Would you abolish TVA? How about Federal Aid to Education? Federal housing? Irrigation? And so on. Each of these has its own answer. I have found it advisable to conclude each answer with a question: Which do you value more, freedom or handouts? You cannot have both.

IT IS AN ODD thing that nobody is against freedom, not even those who equate freedom with handouts. Sometimes the questioner will assert that "freedom from want" is the only freedom, and in such cases I ask how much they want to pay for that kind of freedom. It is an odd thing that these people do not know they have to pay for what they get "for free"; the collectivist mind is convinced that somebody else pays.

Sometimes, repeal of the Sixteenth Amendment is labelled "fascistic." I have heard that charge. When you point out that any form of collectivist government, fascist or communist, is impossible without the power to confiscate incomes, the questioner seems surprised. Yet it is a self-evident fact that political control of the people must be accompanied by economic control.

And then, the repeal proposal is frequently called "reactionary"; it is, they say, an attempt to "turn back the clock." Unfortunately, people that grew up under the income tax are unfamiliar with the history of the country, and you are faced with the task of reminding them how our great industrial empire was built: how the ambitious boy plowed back his savings into some enterprise, which began in a dream and ended up a reality. Thrift was a virtue that paid big dividends. However, thrift and ambition and initiative are lost values because the income tax takes away one's savings even before the earner sees them. If getting ahead is "reactionary," then I am all for it.

There are some funny questions that are really not questions at all — just facetious comments. For instance, I was once asked how many people would have to go to jail before the income tax is repealed. The Government has not gotten around to jailing people for advocating the repeal of the Sixteenth Amendment. If enough people make enough noise about it, a movement for repeal will be effective. The method advocated is to appeal to the state governments, which have a very vital interest in repeal, to take an active interest in the movement. The state governments will get behind it if they know they have the support of the people.

Once the following question was handed to me: "Why don't you run for the Presidency?" I replied: "Heaven forbid! If I were elected President of the United States I wouldn't want to repeal the income tax. I would need the money to buy votes in the next election."

Additional copies of this 4-page Article: single copy 20¢ (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1,000 copies $30. In 5,000 lots $25 per thousand. News section sold separately — at same rates. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery, add one cent a copy, for airmail, add two cents a copy.

Corinne Griffith, the former actress, has for some years been a leader in the movement to repeal the Sixteenth Amendment, and has lectured widely on the subject.

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. $10 per year.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS, new subscribers only: 5 weeks for $1.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED